Filed 08/13/2008

Page 1 of 13

Case 3:08-cv-01472-BEN-POR Document 1

2

4

5

7 8

9

1011

12

1314

1516

17

18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

2627

28

I. SUMMARY

1. This is a civil rights action by plaintiff A. J. Oliver ("Oliver") for discrimination at the building, structure, facility, complex, property, land, development, and/or surrounding business complex known as:

Pep Boys #651 454 Broadway Chula Vista, CA 91910

(hereafter "the Store")

2. Oliver seeks damages, injunctive and declaratory relief, attorney fees and costs, against The Pep Boys Manny Moe & Jack of California dba Pep Boys #651 and Robert Sarkis Lion (collectively "Pep Boys") pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, (42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 et seq.), and related California statutes.

II. JURISDICTION

- 3. This Court has original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343 for ADA claims.
- 4. Supplemental jurisdiction for claims brought under parallel California law—arising from the same nucleus of operative facts—is predicated on 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
 - 5. Oliver's claims are authorized by 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

III. VENUE

6. All actions complained of herein take place within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Southern District of California, and venue is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), (c).

IV. PARTIES

7. Pep Boys owns, operates, and/or leases the Store, and consists of a person (or persons), firm, and/or corporation.

Oliver v. The Pep Boys Manny Moe & Jack of California, et al.
Plaintiff's Complaint

Plaintiff's Complaint

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

8. Oliver suffered a stroke approximately 13 years ago. The stroke left him paralyzed, speech impaired, and unable to stand or walk. Oliver requires the use of a motorized wheelchair when traveling about in public. Consequently, Oliver is "physically disabled," as defined by all applicable California and United States laws, and a member of the public whose rights are protected by these laws.

V. FACTS

- 9. The Store is a sales or retail establishment, open to the public, which is intended for nonresidential use and whose operation affects commerce.
- 10. Oliver visited the Store and encountered barriers (both physical and intangible) that interfered with—if not outright denied—his ability to use and enjoy the goods, services, privileges, and accommodations offered at the facility. To the extent known by Oliver, the barriers at the Store included, but are not limited to, the following:
 - There is no tow away signage posted;
 - At least one disabled parking stall has a cross slope that exceeds 2.0%;
 - The access aisle adjacent to the disabled parking has a cross slope that exceeds 2.0%;
 - There are no spaces designated as "van accessible;"
 - The platform leading into the southwest entrance (furthest from Broadway) is not level;
 - The platform leading into the main entrance (closest to Broadway) is not level;
 - There is no International Symbol of Accessibility at either entrance;
 - The counters in the service area are too high and do not have a portion lowered to accommodate patrons in wheelchairs;
 - The pay point machines in the service area are too high;

28

14

15

13

16 17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25 26

28

27

- The counters in the parts area are too high and do not have a portion lowered to accommodate patrons in wheelchairs;
- The signage at the entrance to the men's restroom is not correct;
- The entrance door to the men's restroom requires twisting;
- The drinking fountain is too high;
- The pipes underneath the lavatory are not wrapped;
- There is insufficient clear floor space between the water closet and the lavatory;
- The grab bars do not extend 24 inches from the front of the water closet; and.
- The operable part of the paper towel dispenser is mounted more than 40 inches from the floor.

These barriers prevented Oliver from enjoying full and equal access.

- 11. Oliver was also deterred from visiting the Store because he knew that the Store's goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and accommodations were unavailable to physically disabled patrons (such as himself). He continues to be deterred from visiting the Store because of the future threats of injury created by these barriers.
- 12. Oliver also encountered barriers at the Store, which violate state and federal law, but were unrelated to his disability. Nothing within this complaint, however, should be construed as an allegation that Oliver is seeking to remove barriers unrelated to his disability.
- Pep Boys knew that these elements and areas of the Store were 13. inaccessible, violate state and federal law, and interfere with (or deny) access to the physically disabled. Moreover, Pep Boys has the financial resources to remove these barriers from the Store (without much difficulty or expense), and make the Store accessible to the physically disabled. To date, however, Pep

exemption to excuse non-compliance.

Boys refuses to either remove those barriers or seek an unreasonable hardship

- 14. At all relevant times, Pep Boys has possessed and enjoyed sufficient control and authority to modify the Store to remove impediments to wheelchair access and to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines and Title 24 regulations. Pep Boys has not removed such impediments and has not modified the Store to conform to accessibility standards. Pep Boys has intentionally maintained the Store in its current condition and has intentionally refrained from altering the Store so that it complies with the accessibility standards.
- 15. Oliver further alleges that the (continued) presence of barriers at the Store is so obvious as to establish Pep Boys' discriminatory intent. On information and belief, Oliver avers that evidence of this discriminatory intent includes Pep Boys' refusal to adhere to relevant building standards; disregard for the building plans and permits issued for the Store; conscientious decision to the architectural layout (as it currently exists) at the Store; decision not to remove barriers from the Store; and allowance that the Store continues to exist in its non-compliant state. Oliver further alleges, on information and belief, that Pep Boys is not in the midst of a remodel, and that the barriers present at the Store are not isolated (or temporary) interruptions in access due to maintenance or repairs.²

VI. FIRST CLAIM

Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990

Denial of "Full and Equal" Enjoyment and Use

16. Oliver incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 15 for this claim.

E.g., Gunther v. Lin, 144 Cal. App. 4th 223, fn. 6

Id.; 28 C.F.R. § 36.211(b)

Oliver v. The Pep Boys Manny Moe & Jack of California, et al.

14

15

13

16 17

19

18

20 21

23

24

22

25 26

27

28

- 17. Title III of the ADA holds as a "general rule" that no individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment (or use) of goods, services, facilities, privileges, and accommodations offered by any person who owns, operates, or leases a place of public accommodation. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).
- 18. Pep Boys discriminated against Oliver by denying "full and equal enjoyment" and use of the goods, services, facilities, privileges or accommodations of the Store during each visit and each incident of deterrence.

Failure to Remove Architectural Barriers in an Existing Facility

- 19. The ADA specifically prohibits failing to remove architectural barriers, which are structural in nature, in existing facilities where such removal is readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). The term "readily achievable" is defined as "easily accomplishable and able to be carried out without much difficulty or expense." Id. § 12181(9).
- When an entity can demonstrate that removal of a barrier is not 20. readily achievable, a failure to make goods, services, facilities, or accommodations available through alternative methods is also specifically prohibited if these methods are readily achievable. Id. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(v).
- Here, Oliver alleges that Pep Boys can easily remove the 21. architectural barriers at the Store without much difficulty or expense, and that Pep Boys violated the ADA by failing to remove those barriers, when it was readily achievable to do so.
- In the alternative, if it was not "readily achievable" for Pep Boys to remove the Store's barriers, then Pep Boys violated the ADA by failing to make the required services available through alternative methods, which are readily achievable.

Failure to Design and Construct an Accessible Facility

- 23. On information and belief, the Store was designed or constructed (or both) after January 26, 1992—independently triggering access requirements under Title III of the ADA.
- 24. The ADA also prohibits designing and constructing facilities for first occupancy after January 26, 1993, that aren't readily accessible to, and usable by, individuals with disabilities when it was structurally practicable to do so. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(1).
- 25. Here, Pep Boys violated the ADA by designing or constructing (or both) the Store in a manner that was not readily accessible to the physically disabled public—including Oliver—when it was structurally practical to do so.³

Failure to Make an Altered Facility Accessible

- 26. On information and belief, the Store was modified after January 26, 1992, independently triggering access requirements under the ADA.
- 27. The ADA also requires that facilities altered in a manner that affects (or could affect) its usability must be made readily accessible to individuals with disabilities to the maximum extent feasible. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2). Altering an area that contains a facility's primary function also requires adding making the paths of travel, bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving that area accessible to the maximum extent feasible. <u>Id.</u>
- 28. Here, Pep Boys altered the Store in a manner that violated the ADA and was not readily accessible to the physically disabled public—including Oliver—to the maximum extent feasible.

Failure to Modify Existing Policies and Procedures

29. The ADA also requires reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures, when necessary to afford such goods, services,

Plaintiff's Complaint

Nothing within this Complaint should be construed as an allegation that plaintiff is bringing this action as a private attorney general under either state or federal statutes.

Oliver v. The Pep Boys Manny Moe & Jack of California, et al.

facilities, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the entity can demonstrate that making such modifications would fundamentally alter their nature. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).

- 30. Here, Pep Boys violated the ADA by failing to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures at the Store, when these modifications were necessary to afford (and would not fundamentally alter the nature of) these goods, services, facilities, or accommodations.
- 31. Oliver seeks all relief available under the ADA (*i.e.*, injunctive relief, attorney fees, costs, legal expense) for these aforementioned violations. 42 U.S.C. § 12205.
- 32. Oliver also seeks a finding from this Court (*i.e.*, declaratory relief) that Pep Boys violated the ADA in order to pursue damages under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act or Disabled Persons Act.

VII. SECOND CLAIM

Disabled Persons Act

- 33. Oliver incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 30 for this claim.
- 34. California Civil Code § 54 states, in part, that: Individuals with disabilities have the same right as the general public to the full and free use of the streets, sidewalks, walkways, public buildings and facilities, and other public places.
- 35. California Civil Code § 54.1 also states, in part, that: Individuals with disabilities shall be entitled to full and equal access to accommodations, facilities, telephone facilities, places of public accommodation, and other places to which the general public is invited.
- 36. Both sections specifically incorporate (by reference) an individual's rights under the ADA. See Civil Code §§ 54(c) and 54.1(d).

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

25 26

27 28

- 37. Here, Pep Boys discriminated against the physically disabled public—including Oliver—by denying them full and equal access to the Store. Pep Boys also violated Oliver's rights under the ADA, and, therefore, infringed upon or violated (or both) Oliver's rights under the Disabled Persons Act.
- 38. For each offense of the Disabled Persons Act, Oliver seeks actual damages (both general and special damages), statutory minimum damages of one thousand dollars (\$1,000), declaratory relief, and any other remedy available under California Civil Code § 54.3.
- He also seeks to enjoin Pep Boys from violating the Disabled 39. Persons Act (and ADA) under California Civil Code § 55, and to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and incurred under California Civil Code §§ 54.3 and 55.

VIII. THIRD CLAIM

Unruh Civil Rights Act

- Oliver incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 40. through 30 for this claim.
- California Civil Code § 51 states, in part, that: All persons within 41. the jurisdiction of this state are entitled to the full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishments of every kind whatsoever.
- California Civil Code § 51.5 also states, in part, that: No business 42. establishment of any kind whatsoever shall discriminate against any person in this state because of the disability of the person.
- 43. California Civil Code § 51(f) specifically incorporates (by reference) an individual's rights under the ADA into the Unruh Act.
- 44. Pep Boys' aforementioned acts and omissions denied the physically disabled public—including Oliver—full and equal accommodations, advantages,

 facilities, privileges and services in a business establishment (because of their physical disability).

- 45. These acts and omissions (including the ones that violate the ADA) denied, aided or incited a denial, or discriminated against Oliver by violating the Unruh Act.
- 46. Oliver was damaged by Pep Boys' wrongful conduct, and seeks statutory minimum damages of four thousand dollars (\$4,000) for each offense.
- 47. Oliver also seeks to enjoin Pep Boys from violating the Unruh Act (and ADA), and recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred under California Civil Code § 52(a).

IX. FOURTH CLAIM

Denial of Full and Equal Access to Public Facilities

- 48. Oliver incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 13 for this claim.
- 49. Health and Safety Code § 19955(a) states, in part, that: California public accommodations or facilities (built with private funds) shall adhere to the provisions of Government Code § 4450.
- 50. Health and Safety Code § 19959 states, in part, that: Every existing (non-exempt) public accommodation constructed prior to July 1, 1970, which is altered or structurally repaired, is required to comply with this chapter.
- 51. Oliver alleges the Store is a public accommodation constructed, altered, or repaired in a manner that violates Part 5.5 of the Health and Safety Code or Government Code § 4450 (or both), and that the Store was not exempt under Health and Safety Code § 19956.
- 52. Pep Boys' non-compliance with these requirements at the Store aggrieved (or potentially aggrieved) Oliver and other persons with physical disabilities. Accordingly, he seeks injunctive relief and attorney fees pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 19953.

Oliver v. The Pep Boys Manny Moe & Jack of California, et al.

Plaintiff's Complaint

This includes attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

Oliver v. The Pep Boys Manny Moe & Jack of California, et al.

CIVIL COVER SHEET

Significant a service of the

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS	9 1 tu tu tu	
A.J. Oliver		The Pep Boys N	M abbly MdG & Jack Hfl¢aling nia dba Pep Boys	
(b) Court especial	AFFIRM Linear Plainting SAN DIEGO		#651; Robert Sarkis Lion	
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff SAN DIEGO (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)		County of Residence g	County of Residence of the Hall State Definition of County of Residence of the Hall State of the County of Residence of the Hall State of the County of Residence of the Hall State of the Hall	
			D CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE	
			A L TO FEE BLOOP	
• •	s, Address, and Telephone Number)	Attorneys (If Known)	U8 CV 1472 BEN POR	
.YNN HUBBARD, III I2 Williamsburg Lane(DISABLED ADVOCACY GROUP, AF Chico, CA 95926 (530) 895-3252	PLC		
II. BASIS OF JURISI			PRINCIPAL PARTIES(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		and One Box for Defendant) TF DEF PTF DEF 1	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2	
		Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3	
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)			
☐ 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY		□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 400 State Reapportionment	
□ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Slander 368 Asbestos Person 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability 385 Property Damage Product Liability 360 Other Personal Product Liability	de company 21 USC 881 630 Liquor Laws 640 R.R. & Truck 650 Airline Regs. 660 Occupational 650 Other 670 The Franch 670 Other 710 Fair Labor Standards 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting 2 Disclosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act 462 Naturalization Application 463 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee 464 Net and Part 465 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee 645 Naturalization 650 Airline Regs. 640 Rev. & Truck 650 Airline Regs. 710 Fair Labor Standards 720 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting 80 Disclosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act 750 Cherry Regs. 750 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting 80 Disclosure Act 750 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting 750 La	B61 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g)) 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609 Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 294 Energy Allocation Act 395 Freedom of Information Act 900Appeal of Fee Determination	
V. ORIGIN (Place	Other Other Civil Rights an "X" in One Box Only)	465 Other Immigration Actions	State Statutes Appeal to District	
	emoved from 3 Remanded from tate Court Appellate Court		eferred from	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you a 42 U.S.C. Section 12 U., et set Brief description of cause: Ongoing violations of the ADA (al statutes unless diversity):	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTIO UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	N DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: ☐ Yes No	
VIII. RELATED CAS	SE(S) (See instructions): JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE 08/12/2008	SIGM, TURE OF A	TTORNEY OF RECORD		
RECEIPT # 153968	AMOUNT 4350 APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUDGE	
\langle	AC 4/13/08			

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN DIEGO DIVISION

153968 - TC

August 13, 2008 11:01:41

Civ Fil Non-Pris

USAD # .: 08CV1472

Judge..: ROGER T BENITEZ

Amount.:

\$350.00 CC

Total-> \$350.00

FROM: A.J. OLIVER

VS.

PEP BOYS